DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 384 JC 950 344

AUTHOR Farley, Barbara L.
TITLE "A" Is for Average: The Grading Crisis in Today's Colleges.
INSTITUTION Princeton Univ., NJ. Mid-Career Fellowship Program.
PUB DATE Jun 95
NOTE 30p.; In its: Issues of Education at Community Colleges: Essays by Fellows in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University; see JC 950 341.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Change Strategies; Community Colleges; Educational Improvement; *Educational Policy; Educational Trends; *Grade Inflation; *Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; Two Year Colleges; Universities

ABSTRACT

According to recent research, from Ivy League universities to community colleges only between 10% and 20% of students receive grades lower than a "B-," while the most frequently given grade is an "A." Causes of this grade inflation can be found in students' objections to receiving "D's" and "F's" after paying high tuitions and even the well-meaning intentions of faculty who feel that low grades demoralize students. The issue is especially acute for community colleges, as many students have borderline skills and motivation for continuing their education. Recommendations that have been proposed to reduce grade inflation include the following: (1) persuading faculty to regard "C+"/"B-" as the appropriate median grade; (2) noting median grades and class sizes next to course grades on students' transcripts; (3) indexed grading, where letter grades would be changed to two-number values, the first corresponding to the quality points assigned to student performance and the second to the average grade assigned by that professor for the semester, course, and section; (4) simply grading in tenths of a point from 0.0 to 4.0; (5) replacing the system of letter/number grades with word-based evaluations; and (6) using daily grades received through pop quizzes or short writing assignments. The essential ingredient in any grading policy, however, is that information on criteria be effectively communicated before a course begins. (Contains 8 exhibits and 18 references.) (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 384

A IS FOR AVERAGE:

THE GRADING CRISIS IN TODAY'S COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Fellows Seminar/
History 520, 1994-5

Barbara L. Farley
Ocean County College
Toms River, New Jersey

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Rabb

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 950 344 KP

THE PROBLEM: Introduction

Although considered by some to be cyclical and, therefore, not of critical concern, the problem this go-around is not only not disappearing, but, according to newspaper accounts, both academic and otherwise, is escalating. Grade inflation is a creeping paralysis in our midst, sapping the strength of our academic systems. From 1985 to present, the percentages of A's granted to students has increased steadily, especially in the Arts and Humanities courses, to the point that, in many colleges, A is the most commonly given grade. The questions to be answered are: What is the nature of the dilemma? How widespread? Why is it happening? Finally, what is the solution?

Identification of the dilemma: In an informal informational handout (Exhibit 1) provided for readers at a norming session for the department-wide English final, Rutgers University has improvised a criteria for grades which is, more or less, consonant with accepted beliefs. Beliefs, perhaps, but practices, no! And even these published guidelines has a self-proclaimed nebulous area, - the D grade. But that does not begin to address the disparity between theory and practice. According to the research which supports this paper, only between ten and twenty per cent of students from Ivy League colleges to community colleges receive grades less than a B-, with the most frequently

given grade an A. Something is rotten in the state of Wittenberg.

Surely, this must portend that students are better prepared than ever before. NOT!!! One has to have been living on Mars to accept that pronouncement. Although conditions are not quite as grave as the cartoon provided (Exhibit 2) would indicate, it comes close enough to lend a slight nervous edge to our laughter. We in the remedial-ridden community college classes are especially sensitive to this issue but more of that later.

What about the degree of sophistication and difficulty of the course work? Perhaps, with the new technology, courses are weightier, require more intelligence or sounder critical thinking. Wrong again !! According to the July 4, 1994 edition of Forbes magazine, "You can graduate from some Ivy League colleges and others without taking a single course in history, math, economics or many other sciences, without encountering Shakespeare, Plato, the United States Constitution, Abraham Lincoln, or Milton Friedman." (Sowell 82)

What about transcripts and grade point averages? Surely all students cannot do exemplary or "A" work in all subjects. The key phrase here is "all subjects." As indicated above, students can avoid the more challenging courses and take what are know as "gut" courses. They can also withdraw right up to final exams with no negative notation on their transcripts. I personally had a student last semester who withdrew rather than receive a B which would reduce her grade point average. Students

can repeat courses ad infinitum or until they receive the desired A. Community colleges are guilty on all counts.

Stated simply, the rise in the average level of undergraduate grades coincides with a decline during the same period in national average scores on the SAT's and ACT's. (Weller 51) Consequently, there has been a significant decrease in the reliability of the high school record as a predictor of freshman performance and a corresponding increase in reliability of SAT's and ACT's. (Andrews 87). The further and more damaging consequence is that employers are become wary of the school systems and have "tended to disregard grades and school evaluation and rely more on the job applicant's attitude, behavior and job experience." See Exhibit 3 (Applebome F20)

Who and Where are the culprits? Apparently, from the Ivy Leagues to the local community colleges, the inflation is widespread. The problem starts at the top. Bill Clinton is quoted by David Maraniss in his biography of the president, First in His Class, as admitting that, when he taught at the University of Arkansas, he only gave A's and B's in order not to discourage students.(45) The Rest:

STANFORD: The first to outlaw D's and F's, to permit withdrawal without transcript taint. The most frequently given grade: A.

DARTMOUTH: In the last 20 years, the average grade point average went from 3.06 to 3.23, 3.36 in the Humanities. (Notebook A8)

HARVARD: Less than 20 % of the students had an average of less than B-, 43% were in the A range. (Vigoda 14)

RUTGERS: The classroom autonomy of the professor is in jeopardy due to the college's perceived mandate to control the inflation. Letters like that in Exhibit 4 will be commonplace.

BRYN MAWR: Summa Cum Laude graduates quadrupled between 1993 and 1994, a one year period. (Vigoda 14)

OCEAN COUNTY: Now we are getting to it. Although I suspected otherwise, I had hoped to report that we in the community college sector had not followed the trend. However, the numbers do not lie. The most frequently given grade in the Spring 1994 semester was an A, in some cases as high as 23%; the A/B+/B range accounted for 50% of all grades. (See Exhibit 5) Although not all the 19 New Jersey community colleges are represented, my research, corroborated by Exhibit 6,7 and 8 from two New Jersey community colleges and a state university, shows this trend to be typical, and the bald truth seems to be that we are all guilty, if guilt there be, to some degree.

When did all this start? The issues of eroding family life and earlier education aside, the downward spiral in the colleges seems to have started in the sixties with the increased student input into all aspects of college life and with the increased reluctance of college professors to fail students who were about to defend our country and our lives in Viet Nam.

Why has this happened. This seems to be the crucial question since improvement is inherently tied to an understanding

of the causes. In the June 13, 1994 Newsweek article, the Vietnam War gets the blame.(Reibstein 62) Why not? It has become the scapegoat for so many problems. Professors did not want to flunk students about to fight in a foreign war. Therefore, Stanford University abolished D's and F's. "Students, professors and college administrators began viewing grades as artificial measurements and irrelevant encumbrances..." (Reibstein 62) There was the sense that students should be encouraged to "explore new possibilities without jeopardizing their grades." (Reibstein 62)

Of course, there are the more mundane considerations: high grades go hand in hand with high tuition. Students, such as those at the University of Oregon, have been known to complain that whey they pay so much to go to that university, they shouldn't be given D's and F's. Today, both students and parents are more uptight and vocal about grades, according to Karen Tidmarsh, undergraduate dean at Bryn Mawr. (Vigoda 15)

Since grading, especially in the humanities and social sciences, is subjective, there is a lack of a broad based criteria. Some professors with high class enrollments envision themselves as "popular," instead of simply "easy." Graduate assistants teaching courses often want to be accepted and tend to grade higher. (Vigoda 14)

There are, of course, those who blame grade inflation on the administration, under the heading of affirmative action (No one wants to lose government funding) or college sport star inflation (or alumni funding). This is perhaps another and a

distinct issue to be dealt with.

Finally, there are those in complete denial. Under the heading, "A's Aren't That Easy," in the May 17, 1995 issue of the New York Times, Clifford Adelman, a senior research analyst with the Department of Education, informs us that "contrary to the widespread lamentations, grades actually declined slightly in the last two decades." He uses Department of Education statistics to support his position, - (A21) and the Devil can quote the Scriptures for his purposes.

While many of us find these explanations patently faulty, we may be the same ones guilty of grade inflation, however well-meaning our intentions. Some professors insist that poor grades are demoralizing and giving the student some self-esteem is part of their mission.

Consider these scenarios: (1) The hard-working student who fails an essay assignment and then does re-write after re-write, but never quite attains the level of B which is finally granted to her/him for diligent effort. After emphasizing the importance of re-writing, some find it difficult not to reward such exertions.

(2) The ESL student whose critical thinking and conceptualizations are formidable, but whose inadequacy with English syntax and idiom are unsatisfactory. How can one grade encompass this dichotomy?

(3) The remedial student, who has made significant strides but judged (as distasteful as that word often is, that is what we do) by the "Rutgers" standard, falls short.

We in the community college sector are especially reprehensible. It is impossible to have even a casual conversation, to say nothing of a department-wide meeting, without encountering the pathetic sigh or the tsk-tsk over the current quality or lack of it of today's student. We are the first line of defense, often dealing with students whose skills and motivation are borderline. How, then, can we defend the grading on the transcripts that we, hopefully, send out to the four year colleges? Are we forced to conform to the same inflationary practices so as to maintain some kind of uniformity? These are the hard questions and I would not want to be graded on my ability to answer them adequately.

SOLUTIONS

How can we improve the situation?. Although many skeptical academics feel that the process is irreversible, solutions continue to be tentatively and optimistically explored. These range from the very simplistic tired bromides to the intricately complex formulations.

Most schools are dealing with their distinct problems on an individual basis. Stanford has voted to restore the F grade, or to call it NC, no credit, but this designation only

appears on internal records. Harvard has reduced the period for students to drop courses and is considering requiring grading on the curve. Bryn Mawr has decided that only the top ten students can be awarded the Summa Cum Laude designation. (Vigoda 15) Rutgers is sending out letters to specific faculty, like the one marked Exhibit 4, the implications of which I think we would all like to avoid. "There is a growing sentiment that grades ought to be an honest reflection of student accomplishment. ("Fighting Grade Inflation," 1255) Small steps, indeed, but in the right direction.

Most suggestions begin with the idea that students and teachers must be provided with a great deal of information <u>at the outset.</u> Teachers must be provided with a comprehensive evaluation of student abilities that will allow them to avoid expecting too much from students. The syllabus must provide the student with <u>specific parameters</u>, details with respect to classroom goals, grading procedures, and consistent and regular feedback on student progress.(McCormick 32)

Another suggestion that is simple enough in proposal but might be difficult if not impossible to implement in any comprehensive way is to persuade faculty of the colleges " to regard C+/B- as the appropriate medjan grade. This average level of achievement would include basic familiarity with course contents, the method by which the subject is pursued, some evidence that the student has used the method." Students who met those criteria would expect to receive a grade in the C range.

"In short, it would be honorable and usual to receive grades in the C range in those fields studied for the first time, as well as in courses of secondary interest to the student." Grades in the B range would show unusual achievement in those areas, while those in the A range would recognize outstanding achievement in all areas. Conversely, failure to meet these criteria would result in a D grade or lower. (O'Connor 299)

Many researchers coupled the above recommendations with a proposed grade reporting system that would provide much more specific information. Dartmouth is noting the median grade and the size of the class next to every mark on the transcript, hoping that students will be less likely to take "gut" courses that are obviously so. Such systems, offer the proponents, would be effective with minimal alteration to the present practices. Following is a sample transcript.

		Distribution of grades					Average GPA	
Course	Grade Achieved	A	B	C	D	F	of class	Comments
Phoenician Pottery	B	12	3	0	0	0	3.2	Student took course one year earlier than customary
So. Columbian Sexual Mores	A	1	112	10	0	0	1.9	Student repeating course
Ancient Greek Dancing	F	53	0	0	0	1	2.4	Only male in class

This plan could be elaborated upon and tailored to the school's reporting system. (Good 30)

A similar policy proposal has been proffered by Robin Grieves of the Dept. of Finance at the University of Nebraska. His scheme, he notes, is clearly that of an economist confronting inflation and is termed indexation.

Mr. Grieves indicates that indexed grading would be "virtually identical to current grading. No more faculty inputs and very few additional administrative inputs would be necessary to implement the change. The letter grades would be changed to a two-number grading system. The first number (4.0, 3.0, 2.0, 1.0, 0.0) would correspond to the quality points assigned to the grade. The second number would be the average grade assigned by that professor for the semester, course and section in which the student were enrolled. For example, a student who received a B in Econ. 135 from a professor who assigned 3 A's, 5 B's, 5 C's, and 1 D would receive a grade report which read:

ECON 135 3 sem hrs. 3.0/2.7

where 2.7 is the average grade awarded by that professor. The grade now has "the informational content that the student performed slightly above average for the course."

A student's semester report might read:

MGT 290	3 sem.hrs.	4.0/3.5
MGT 360	3 sem.hrs.	3.0/3,8
MGT 345	3 sem.hrs.	4.0/3.3
ECON225	3 sem.hrs.	3.33/3.25

This kind of grade indexing removes any question of unfair treatment at the hands of a hard grader. (2-3)

Researchers at the University of California, Riverside indicate that simply grading in tenths of a point from 0.0 to 4.0 tended to decrease grade inflation at their institution. (Suslow 45)

Continuing in that vein, Sidney Suslow, Director of the Office of Institutional Research at the University of California, Berkeley recommended providing students with a complete listing of undergraduate courses with instructor's names and percent distribution of letter grades, A through F. The intent of these last two suggestions is to "let everyone know the relative worth of each letter grade in each course." (45)

William Cole, in his much-discussed article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, would like to scrap the whole system of letter or number grades and replace it with words. Letter grades, he insists, "have been hopelessly devalued to the extent that C can never again be average." This grading system could be replaced with a student self-evaluation in tandem with a carefully written faculty one. This system has been utilized most effectively in such colleges as Goddard College in Vermont and Evergreen State College in Washington State. Twenty per cent of the student's grade, under this system, might be reserved for "class participation for down-grading students who perform in a perfunctory manner."

Yet another proposal has been advanced by Jay Ellis Ransom of Portland Community College, who suggests that students must be provided with a daily grade, arrived at through a pop quiz or a short writing assignment. He feels certain that any "day-to-day differences in mood, capability and comprehension will wash over over the course of a semester." The result would be on-going information provided to the student. In his plan, the final examination in any course would not be an examination on the course content. Rather, "it should constitute a preview of the subsequent course in that subject field. The final examination need not be graded at all and should be wholly 'open book' with pupils working together in pairs or in groups....A final examination should be primarily a learning situation, not a recall of past information. Those who have mastered the information will do well on the advanced material; those who did not study effectively will be less able to extrapolate from the course content in a creative way. Hence the open book final exam becomes a learning device of great merit."(475-6)

Louis Goldman, in an impressively erudite article in the Journal of Higher Education entitled "The Betrayal of the Gate Keepers: Grade Inflation," reminds us of the mission of the college or university, which is "not only to train people for practical professional competence but also to recognize that true competence transcends narrow practicality and educates broadly as well. Insofar as the university is able to maintain this mission, it is the prime, nay the essential, agent of freedom and

humanity as we know them." Clearly this is not a new idea, echoing the Platonic model; however, we in the community college sector, I think, might need reminding that we are the first line of defense of this mission.(114)

Undergraduate degrees, Mr. Goldman worries, will come to be regarded as lightly as high school diplomas. To bolster their sagging value, colleges will be forced to employ exit exams. In fact, this is already a fact of academic life. Rutgers has had exit exams from their composition courses for some time. At Ocean County College, we have recently convened a committee on the possibility of exit testing. As part of our investigation into the subject, we polled all the other New Jersey community colleges to determine if, in fact, they used exit testing for their composition courses, and what procedures were utilized. We also requested information on how effective these tests were considered to be. Virtually all the New Jersey community colleges had either instituted some form of exit testing or it was being seriously considered. Those who had it in place were satisfied that it was effective in upholding certain grade standards.

"Business and industry will increasingly disregard degrees in placement and promotion practices" and rely on their own testing, and perhaps, schooling. I had to be impressed with Mr. Goldman's clairvoyance in this 1985 article when the N.Y. Times article above referenced of Monday, February 20, 1995 described just such a scenario. We have all heard of corporation's teaching business writing courses in-house. The

Community Education non-credit programs are flooded with requests from companies for classes on basic skills.

As we have seen, most solutions to the predicament involve the grading system itself, and clearly there are aspects of the grading system to be addressed. For example, perhaps remedial courses need not be given letter grades. Since the issue is one of whether or not the student is qualified to take college level courses, perhaps a grade of Q for qualified or U for unqualified would be sufficient. What about the question of whether or not the grades from remedial courses should be included in a student's grade point average? Should the grades for these courses, which, for the most part, are non-credit courses and pre-college level in nature, be counted as part of the student's overall performance at college? On the other hand, in other courses, perhaps there needs to be more grading choices. In the Humanities department at Ocean County College, one must achieve a level of C to pass certain courses; therefore, a D is the same as an F. It might be preferable to have some grade between what is perceived as average (C) and failing (D or F).

However, having given all these technical solutions to the grading quandary, perhaps we are not dealing with the root of the problem, which is one for which the student and the professor must each bear a portion of the responsibility. We have hinted at this solution at the outset and that is the question of academic preparedness. The student and professor must start each semester with certain information that is crucial to the success

of the course. To that end, we have initiated certain programs at Ocean County College designed to deal with this lack of preparation. We have convened a committee originally identified as the Committee on Student Preparedness. Since the initial meeting, we realized that this is a most lopsided title and the committee has been re-christened the Committee on Academic Preparedness, attesting to the fact that we understand that this problem must be dealt with on both sides of the instructional desk.

The mission of this committee is to direct our attention to what is perceived as a lack of success in classroom performance. We can all quote the statistics as to the more than 70% of high school students who admit that they spend less than five hours a week on homework. But, according to Louis Goldman, it is the colleges, not the high schools, that are the new gatekeepers, and we at the community college level are at the outside gate. The high schools are required by law to take in and graduate students. The job of the colleges, though some of us are loathe to do it, is to set up the rules for entry into the adult world and assist students in the transition. This process has a personal as well as a social dimension. A major function of education, according to Friedenberg and others, is for the student to discover who he or she is and is not, so that a personal identity can be defined. (Goldman 115) Grade inflation and acceptance of sub-standard behavior patterns give students a distorted view of themselves.

Too often, however, students are not made aware of what the standards are and how stringently they are enforced. At the very outset, the orientation of students into college must focus on the differences between high school and college. They must be made aware of exactly what will be expected of them and exactly what the consequences will be of non-conformance.

As a follow-through, each professor, at the beginning of the course, will need to make his or her course requirements absolutely clear and unequivocal, at the same time listening to students' concerns and addressing them in order to formulate reasonable course requirements. The students at our Academic Preparedness Committee meetings have only confirmed our suspicions that students have a pipeline on those professors whose syllabi are nebulous, and, therefore, challengeable.

At an even more basic level, academic policies must be spelled out. We on the committee found that to inundate students with a flood of pamphlets at a perfunctory orientation is not satisfying the preparedness requirements. One of the academic policies which seems to encourage mediocre performance is the ability of a student to withdraw from courses ad infinitum, or at least until he/she receives a grade that is satisfactory to him/her.

Despite talk of this being a cyclical issue, I do not see this dilemma vanishing. More to the point, the results of the problem going unchecked could be devastating. Besides the suspicions regarding student achievement, the entire academic

product is cheapened, (Weller 56) and, as Louis Goldman warns us, "despite denials, evasions and adroit rationalizations, for whatever reasons, the faculty of our institutions do award the grades and no matter how extenuating the circumstances," (103) they must bear responsibility for grade inflation and these consequences. We can no longer bury our heads in the sand of what is fast becoming an intellectual sandbox.

WORKS CITED

Adelman, Clifford. "A's Aren't That Easy," New York Times, May 17, 1995. A18.

Andrews, Arthur. "Grade Inflation -- How Great," NASSP Bulletin, v67 n466, Nov. 1983, p. 81-88.

Applebome, Peter. "Employers Wary of School System," New York Times, Feb. 20, 1995, p.F20.

Cole, William "By Rewarding Mediocrity, We Discourage Excellence," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Jan. 6, 1993.

"Fighting Grade Inflation." Science. May 27, 1994: 1255.

Goldman, Louis. "The Betrayal of the Gate Keepers: Grade Inflation." Journal of Higher Education.

Good, Irving John. "A Simple Cure for Grade Inflation." Journal of Educational Date Processing. V13-3, p. 29-32.

Grieves, Robin. "A Policy Porposal Regarding Grade Inflation." Education Research Quarterly. v7n2, Summer 1984, p.2-4.

Maraniss, David. First in His Class. New York: Simon & Schuster, p. 32.

McCormick, Michael. "You Can Prevent Distorted Grading." American School Board Journal. v168 n2 Feb. 1981, p. 32.

"Notebook." Chronicle of Higher Education. November 16, 1994, A8.

O'Connor, Daniel. "A Solution to Grade Inflation." Educational Record. v60 n3, Summer 1979 p. 295-300.

Ransom, Jay Ellis. "Halting Grade Inflation." Phi Delta Kappan. v59-7, p. 475-6.

Reibstein, Larry, Patricia King, Debra Rosenberg, Nina Archer Biddle. "Give me an A or Give me Death." Newsweek, June 13, 1994, p. 62.

Sowell, Thomas. "A Gentlemen's 'A'" Forbes July 4, 1994, p.82.

Suslow, Sidney. "Grade Inflation: End of a Trend." Change. vp-3, p.44-5.

Vigoda, Ralph. "Top Colleges Fail to Find Merit in Lenient Grading_System." The Philadelphia Inquirer, December 5, 1994, p. A21.

Weller, L. David. "Attitude Toward Grade Inflation:A Survey of Private_and Public Colleges of Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education. v.18,n1, Fall 1984, p.51-56.

Grading

Students must pass the final examination to pass English 101, 121, 102, or 122. In all other respects, students' final grades are at the discretion of their teacher.

I suggest that you base your final grade primarily on students' formal essays but save yourself room to take other factors into account. Students should not be able to pass your class without attending regularly, and you should make this clear from the outset.

I also suggest that you ask students to keep portfolios of their written work. These put you in a better position to generalize about their writing, and in the case of borderline final exams they can help to decide whether students should pass.

The possible final grades are A, B+, B, C+, C, D, TF, and F.

A means superior work. At an introductory level, they should be rare.

B means good work. Not merely error-free, or clear, or accurate. But good: thoughtful, forceful, well phrased.

C means competent work. Clear, coherent, relatively error-free, but perhaps flawed in some significant way.

D I don't know what this means. We should be avoiding this grade except in special circumstances.

TF means temporary fail. Some teachers use this grade when a piece of work is missing but still expected. Increasingly we are also using this grade for students to whom we want to offer a sustained tutorial opportunity under the direction of our office.

F means unsatisfactory work.

Exhibit 1

Due to Copyright restrictions page 21, exhibit 2 has been omitted. The page contained the "Doonsbury" comic strip from Sunday, October 9, 1994.

Exhibit 3

ATTITUDES

Qualities That Count With Employers

Figures from a Census Bureau survey of 3,000 employers nationwide, conducted in August and September of last year.

When you consider hiring a new non-supervisory or production worker, how important are the following in your decision to hire?

(Ranked on a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 being not important or not considered, and 5 being very important.)

FACTOR	RANK
Attitude	4.6
Communication skills	4.2
Previous work experience	4.0
Recommendations from current employees	3.4
Recommendations from previous employer	3.4
Industry-based credentials certifying skills	3.2
Years of schooling completed	2.9
Score on tests administered as part of interview	2.5
Academic performance (grades)	2.5
Experience or reputation of applicant's school	2.4
Teacher recommendations	2.1

Source: Census Bureau

RUTGERS
Campus at Newark

Department of English • Faculty of Arts and Sciences
University Heights • 360 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. • Newark • New Jersey 07102 • 201/648-5279

September 21, 1994

Dear James,

I have been concerned for some time about the grading in your classes. In my view the grades are too high on average. It is not my policy to interfere with what instructors do in their classes, but I feel in this case the need to speak out about maintaining department standards.

Having taught at Rutgers-Newark since 1980, I know that the reading and writing skills of our students are not strong; in fact, over the past few years the abilities of students have been declining. It has never been the case that all or even a bare majority, of our students are "A" or "B" writers. It is my responsibility as chairman to represent to you that awarding such grades does a disservice to them as well as to the department.

Over the years I have heard too many complaints from students who cannot understand how they can have received an "A" or "B" in lower level classes and then be getting "D's" and "F's" when they move up to 300 level classes. In some cases, perhaps, the higher-level instructors are too strict but I believe the crux of the problem is that many students do not merit the excellent grades they are getting from you.

This is a university, not a state college or a junior college. It is important that students who attend classes here are held to reasonable and defensible standards of performance. While I realize that grade inflation and watered- down standards have become sad facts of life inside and outside the academy, I would like to think that in my small corner of the world we are, if not really succeeding in holding the line, at least staving off the confusion just a little.

Please call or stop by soon to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,

Exhibit 4

GRADE DISTRIBUTION REPORT

SPRING 1994

	A	B+	B	C+	C	D	P	*P	NC	F	W	I	AUDIT	OTHER	A/B+/B
3S	4311	2532	3907	2094	3121	1241	4	0	0	925	3333	438	63	6422033	48.8
	19.6	11.5	17.7	9.5	14.2	5.6	0			4.2	15.1	2	0.3	0.3	
3S	5111	2754	4111	2088	3187	1269	19	18	0	1204	3102	0	64	4722974	52.1
	22.2	12	17.9	9.1	13.9	5.5	0.1	0.1		5.2	13.5		0.3	0.2	
3S	5170	2851	4233	2160	3189	1099	32	21	0	966	2625	0	50	9322489	54.5
	23	12.7	18.8	9.6	14.2	4.9	0.1	0.1		4.3	11.7		0.2	0.4	
3S	4229	2296	3949	2049	2841	1056	1	23	0	829	2598	5	62	19938	57.5
	21.2	11.5	19.8	10.3	14.2	5.3	0	0.1		4.2	13	0	0.3		
3S	3896	2118	3475	1821	2626	1008	36	1	0	762	2563	0	63	118370	51.6
	21.2	11.5	18.9	9.9	14.3	5.5	0.2	0		4.1	14		0.3	0	

EXHIBIT 5

C.C.C.

Grade Distribution History

Academic Year	%A	%B	%C	%D	%S	%F	%NC	%W	%AU*
1973-74	20	26	22	7	-	-	14	11	-
1974-75	23	26	20	7	-	-	14	9	-
1975-76	21	25	20	7	-	-	16	11	-
1976-77	21	24	19	7	-	-	19	10	-
1977-78	21	24	18	6	-	-	18	11	2
1978-79	21	23	17	6	-	-	19	11	3
1979-80	20	23	17	6	-	-	20	10	4
1980-81	22	24	17	6	-	-	19	10	2
1981-82	21	23	17	6	5	13	2	10	4
1982-83	22	24	17	6	5	12	2	10	3
1983-84	21	24	17	5	7	12	3	10	1
1984-85	21	24	17	5	8	11	3	11	2
1985-86	20	23	17	5	9	10	4	11	2
1986-87	21	24	17	5	8	10	3	11	2
1987-88	21	24	17	5	9	9	3	11	2
1988-89	21	24	17	5	8	9	3	12	1
1989-90	21	24	17	5	9	9	3	11	1
1990-91	21	24	17	5	9	9	3	11	1
1991-92	22	23	17	5	9	8	3	11	1
1992-93	22	23	17	5	9	9	3	11	1
1993-94	23	24	16	5	8	9	3	12	1

Note: These calculations are based on headcounts. The "asterisk" grades are calculated with the appropriate letter grade.

* AU represents audit, blank and invalid grades.

Source: Job # ZECS010, Report 1. September 1993

CCAT8.WK1

EXHIBIT 6

Grade Distributions by Division

Division	%A	%B	%C	%D	%S	%F	%NC	%W	%AU*
1991-1992									
Arts & Communications	35	29	12	5	0	6	0	8	4
Business	27	27	19	7	0	7	0	10	2
Humanities	21	28	23	5	0	11	0	11	1
Instructional Resources-1	0	0	0	0	65	0	22	12	0
Instructional Resources - 2	0	0	0	0	62	0	23	15	0
Science & Allied Health	28	31	19	5	0	8	0	8	0
Technology, Computers & Mathematics	24	22	18	8	0	13	0	14	2
Total	22	23	17	5	9	8	3	11	1
1992-1993									
Arts & Communications	38	25	11	4	0	7	0	10	5
Business	25	28	19	7	0	9	0	11	1
Humanities	22	28	22	5	0	11	0	11	1
Instructional Resources-1	0	0	0	0	63	0	23	13	0
Instructional Resources - 2	0	0	0	0	61	0	25	13	1
Science & Allied Health	28	32	20	5	0	8	0	7	0
Technology, Computers & Mathematics	25	22	18	8	0	14	0	13	2
Total	22	23	17	5	9	9	3	11	1

Note: These calculations are based on headcounts. The "asterisk" grades are calculated with the appropriate letter grade.

* AU represents audit, blank and invalid grades.

** Describes grade distribution in AS and SD courses only.

Source: Job #ZECS010, Report 1. September 1993

CCAT3.WK1

Exhibit 7

RELATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF FAS GRADES - SPRING 1990

FAS Departments	Total No of Grade	A %	B+ %	B %	C+ %	C %	D %	F %	PA %	NC %	OTHER %	A,B+,B %
Cinema Studies	0	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Medieval Studies	59	45.76	30.51	18.64	0.00	1.69	0.00	0.00	3.39	0.00	0.00	94.92
Middle Eastern Studies	10	40.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.00
Hebraic Studies	277	31.05	26.35	20.58	6.86	6.50	1.08	0.72	3.25	0.36	3.25	77.98
American Studies	499	29.86	19.84	27.05	7.62	8.82	2.20	0.40	1.20	0.40	2.61	76.75
Chin, Comp Lit, Slav Lang	934	33.40	21.52	21.52	7.17	6.10	1.28	1.82	0.75	0.86	5.57	76.45
Puerto Rican Studies	377	32.63	20.69	21.75	7.16	8.22	1.86	3.18	0.00	1.06	3.45	75.07
Women's Studies	620	17.26	26.13	29.68	7.74	5.81	1.94	3.06	2.10	1.13	5.16	73.06
Germanic Langs & Lits	442	30.77	18.55	22.62	8.37	7.24	2.94	1.36	1.36	0.68	6.11	71.95
Italian	648	29.78	20.83	20.52	9.72	8.95	3.86	1.54	1.54	0.62	2.62	71.14
Africana Studies	1,092	30.59	15.57	23.17	10.26	9.25	4.67	2.11	0.27	0.64	3.48	69.32
Recreation St & Phys Ed	1,099	25.48	20.47	22.84	10.65	8.37	3.64	2.46	0.82	1.18	4.09	68.79
Linguistics	155	32.26	18.71	16.13	9.03	7.10	4.52	1.94	1.29	0.65	8.39	67.10
Spanish & Portuguese	1,506	26.89	15.14	23.84	8.10	11.42	2.66	2.32	0.73	1.00	7.90	65.87
Political Science	4,194	21.65	17.81	26.16	10.23	9.70	3.53	3.22	1.29	0.60	5.82	65.62
Religion	772	22.54	18.52	24.09	11.79	9.59	4.66	2.20	2.20	0.52	3.89	65.16
French	959	23.25	15.85	25.65	8.86	9.91	2.29	2.61	1.98	0.63	8.97	64.75
Geography	1,204	24.54	16.65	25.85	8.59	13.27	4.77	2.60	1.91	1.04	5.20	64.20
Biochemistry	552	30.25	11.05	22.10	4.89	15.76	5.62	2.90	0.00	0.18	7.25	63.41
Anthropology	1,923	25.07	12.84	24.54	8.74	14.35	5.56	2.29	3.07	0.42	3.12	62.45
Classics & Archaeology	481	30.35	12.68	18.71	8.11	12.27	3.95	3.12	4.78	1.25	4.78	61.75
Psychology	6,371	30.06	11.40	19.84	9.14	13.55	5.76	3.89	0.69	0.72	4.96	61.29
Sociology	3,964	23.08	14.56	23.36	11.76	12.76	5.50	2.60	0.98	1.14	4.26	61.00
English	10,189	17.61	17.06	25.75	12.02	8.34	1.32	4.81	6.41	1.57	5.11	60.42
Physics & Astronomy	3,592	23.47	15.26	20.88	9.35	14.67	6.32	5.21	0.36	0.28	4.20	59.60
Art History	1,230	21.63	15.04	21.63	13.09	12.44	3.82	3.66	3.01	0.49	5.20	58.29
Philosophy	3,312	17.87	17.60	22.80	13.86	12.08	4.20	4.11	0.69	0.79	6.01	58.27
Statistics	1,559	24.95	12.64	20.01	7.06	19.18	5.71	3.98	0.26	1.48	4.75	57.60
History	6,175	18.77	13.91	24.15	12.89	12.73	5.05	3.92	1.77	1.57	5.25	56.83
Archaeology	367	20.98	10.35	24.25	9.26	17.98	7.36	3.27	0.82	0.82	4.90	55.59
Geological Sciences	937	16.86	9.61	24.23	9.18	23.27	7.90	2.88	0.75	0.53	4.80	50.69
Biological Sciences	5,060	15.28	9.35	19.25	10.45	27.17	8.28	5.22	0.32	0.79	3.89	43.87
Economics	5,796	12.25	9.77	18.55	17.25	22.71	8.13	3.30	0.67	1.26	6.12	40.56
Chemistry	4,042	11.97	8.98	16.80	13.61	24.10	8.41	10.86	0.00	0.72	4.55	37.75
Mathematics	6,020	12.39	8.49	14.65	9.34	18.90	9.63	13.49	0.23	3.16	9.72	35.53
Interdisciplinary	141	7.09	2.13	2.84	4.26	2.84	0.71	0.00	0.71	0.00	79.43	12.06
Computer Science	2,838	30.35	12.68	18.71	8.11	12.27	3.95	3.12	4.78	1.25	4.78	10.47
Tot. Fac. Arts & Sciences	79,396	20.45	13.66	21.58	11.01	14.62	5.41	4.86	1.62	1.18	5.60	55.70

T. McCoola - 8/3/90

Exhibit 8